

0011

OCT 05 2001

330103

11 BILL HELMER: My name is Bill Helmer. I  
12 work in the environmental office for the Timbisha  
13 Shoshone Tribe. And the tribe will later be sending in  
14 comments and/or tribal resolution regarding the  
15 preliminary site suitability evaluation. I can say just  
16 a few things, but it doesn't officially represent the --  
17 they are not an initial comment from the tribe, it only  
18 comes from the tribal chairperson and the tribal  
19 council.

20 Again I agree with the general comments of  
21 the CGTO that Richard Arnold stated and comments that  
22 were previously stated by Joe Kennedy and others. That  
23 when consultation is performed by going out to the  
24 tribal headquarters at the Timbisha, then it would be  
25 good to have a full presentation which links all the

0012

1 documents and which fully explains the connections  
2 between them and the background between them. And also  
3 tries to explain why these things are pushed when the  
4 science, the full science is not there and complete  
5 because that seems to be proven because every few months  
6 or every year or so the project itself changes. And so

**330103**

7 it's very hard to understand what exactly is going on  
8 when the project changes and you don't have full  
9 analysis for people to look at and see what is really  
10 going on.

11 So it seems obvious to me because of that,  
12 the project is not scientifically driven, it's  
13 politically driven and something that is potentially  
14 dangerous -- not potentially, is known, a known danger  
15 such as this, can't be politically driven. That's  
16 morally wrong and for us now to harm future generations,  
17 that's just not right.

18 And so it has to be gotten back on a time  
19 scale because there is time to really look and  
20 understand the whole problem of nuclear waste. It's not  
21 just there's going to be a big problem because after  
22 Yucca Mountain, nuclear waste is still being produced,  
23 Yucca Mountain is not going to hold it all even if it is  
24 built. And so the whole understanding of nuclear waste  
25 generation nuclear power production has to be looked

0013

1 into. That's what has to be done.

2 And just narrowing the choice to Yucca  
3 Mountain or even narrowing the aspects of one document

**330103**

4 and not really relating it to another document, I think

5 confuses the DOE as much as the general public. And a

6 confused analysis is going to be a dangerous product

7 that future generations are going to have to bear.

8 So as I said earlier, we will have other

9 comments after consultation and after an extended

10 comment period for everybody to fully understand what we

11 have before us to comment on. Thank you.